



472080

1. SITE NAME: Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill 2. WA NO.: 11-5LAN 3. STATE: Michigan

\*\*\*\*\*  
EPA REGION V ARCS CONTRACT AWARD FEE REPORT  
\*\*\*\*\*

4. Check one:      SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT (SER)   X   PERFORMANCE EVENT REPORT (PER)  
5. CONTRACTOR: WW Engineering & Science 6. CONTRACT NUMBER: 68-W8-0079

7. CONTRACTOR REGIONAL MANAGER: Carl Malsom PHONE: (616) 942-9600

8. PROJECT OFFICER (PO): Stephen Nathan PHONE: (312) 886-5496

9. CONTRACTING OFFICER (CO): James Willis PHONE: (312) 886-5858

10. WORK ASSIGNMENT MANAGER (WAM): Mary Beth Novy PHONE: (312) 353-7556

11. PERFORMANCE PERIOD FROM: 11/01/92 TO: 4/30/93

\*\*\*\*\*  
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CATEGORY  
\*\*\*\*\*

12. Check one:   X   OVERALL TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION      PROGRAM MGMT. EVALUATION

\*\*\*\*\*  
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION  
\*\*\*\*\*

13. Check one:  
EVALUATION PREPARED BY   X   WAM      CO      PO

14. Check one:  
  X   OUTSTANDING (5)      EXCEEDED EXPECTATIONS (4)      SATISFACTORY (3)  
     MARGINALLY SATISFACTORY (2)      UNSATISFACTORY (1)

15. **DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES:** This performance period, the contractor has conducted the first phase of field work for this fund-lead RI/FS. This has included installing monitoring wells and collecting groundwater samples as well as performing tests on wells. As analytical results have been received, the contractor has reviewed the data and has addressed several problems concerning data quality with the Central Regional Laboratory. The contractor has begun work on a Phase I Data Summary Report and the Risk Assessment, and has planned some additional geophysical work to be conducted in May.

16. **OVERALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:** Overall, I feel the contractor has done an outstanding job on this project. Field work has proceeded smoothly and the project is currently ahead of the original schedule and under budget.

17. **STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES/NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS:** Site Manager has a lot of foresight and a good sense of scheduling and where things are heading, which enables her to plan activities and personnel well in advance and to highlight potential problems and issues to the RPM early. Maintains good contact with RPM, although when a lot of activity was occurring at the site in the fall, and things were going smoothly, the RPM was not always aware of day-to-day or weekly progress. This is not a major weakness, however, just a personal preference of the RPM. The was discussed with the Site Manager at the time. Another strength is the experience of the field technicians; it was apparent that they were not being trained on this job.

18. EVALUATOR SIGNATURE: Mary Beth Novy

DATE: 4-25-93

MJ  
4/27/93

1. SITE NAME: Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill 2. WA NO.: 11-5LAN 3. STATE: Michigan

\*\*\*\*\*  
EPA REGION V ARCS CONTRACT AWARD FEE REPORT  
\*\*\*\*\*

4. Check one: ☐ SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT (SER) ☒ PERFORMANCE EVENT REPORT (PER)

5. CONTRACTOR: WW Engineering & Science 6. CONTRACT NUMBER: 68-W8-0079

7. CONTRACTOR REGIONAL MANAGER: Carl Malsom PHONE: (616) 942-9600

8. PROJECT OFFICER (PO): Pat Vogtman PHONE: (312) 886-9553

9. CONTRACTING OFFICER (CO): James Willis PHONE: (312) 886-5858

10. WORK ASSIGNMENT MANAGER (WAM): Mary Beth Novy PHONE: (312) 353-7556

11. PERFORMANCE PERIOD FROM: 05/01/92 TO: 10/31/92

=====

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CATEGORY

12. Check one: ☒ OVERALL TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION ☐ PROGRAM MGMT. EVALUATION

=====

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

13. Check one:  
EVALUATION PREPARED BY ☒ WAM ☐ CO ☐ PO

14. Check one:  
☐ OUTSTANDING (5) ☒ EXCEEDED EXPECTATIONS (4) ☐ SATISFACTORY (3)  
☐ marginally SATISFACTORY (2) ☐ UNSATISFACTORY (1)

-----

15. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES: Completed preparation of RI/FS Work Plan, Sampling and Analysis Plan, QAPP, Health and Safety Plan and budget. Work Plan and budget were approved in July. Bid and awarded subcontracts for site preparation, survey and drilling activities. Mobilized for field activities, completed site survey and initial geophysical surveys, and started drilling activities.

-----

16. OVERALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: Contractor is very good technically, knowledgeable and uses personnel well. Project manager is organized and very aware of schedule and budget issues. Contractor has successfully mobilized for field activities and the investigation is proceeding well.

-----

17. STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES/NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS: Good contact with RPM, although contact during field investigations concerning day to day events and schedule changes could be improved by providing a written weekly summary of activities and projections.

-----

18. EVALUATOR SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORE SHEET**  
 \*\*\*\*\*

19. **PROJECT PLANNING** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1  
 [Organizing (e.g. work plan development, data review); Scheduling; Budgeting]  
 Work plan development took into account and balanced the wishes and goals of the EPA HQ pilot project team and the State of Michigan concerns. Streamlined approaches were developed and field activities were planned in order to utilize information gathered in the field to optimize decisions on sampling and drilling locations.

20. **TECHNICAL COMPETENCE & INNOVATION** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1  
 [Effectiveness of analysis; Meet plan goals; Expert testimony; Support COE/State/Enforcement; Adhere to Regs & procedures; Approach creativity/ingenuity]  
 The approach to the project (using information as it is gathered to make quick decisions without downtime) requires quick analysis of field data and recommendations on how to proceed. The contractor has demonstrated strong technical skills in developing and implementing the field investigation. Geophysical data was analyzed quickly and recommendations on landfill boundaries and drilling locations and additional geophysical work were made. The project manager identifies problems to the RPM in a timely manner and consistently provides recommendations and solutions.

21. **SCHEDULE & COST CONTROL** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1  
 [Budget (hours & cost) maintenance; Priority schedule adjustments; Cost minimization.]  
 Adjustments made to schedule as necessary due to factors beyond the control of the contractor, such as availability of subcontractors, access issues, QAPP approval and sample scheduling. Conscious of downtime and constantly makes small adjustments to field schedule to minimize this. Worked to expeditiously bid and award subcontracts to minimize delays in project. Project manager is very aware of schedule and cost issues.

22. **REPORTING** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1  
 [Timeliness of deliverables; Clarity; Thoroughness]  
 During approval processes, changes to documents such as the work plan, budget and QAPP were made quickly by the contractor in order to speed the process. Quick turnaround on results of field investigations, results of geophysical surveys with recommendations on how to proceed were available to EPA and the State within a week of field activity.

23. **RESOURCE UTILIZATION** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1  
 [Staffing; Subcontracting; Equipment, Travel, etc.]  
 Staff is knowledgeable and utilized in an effective and efficient manner. Field technicians are experienced and handle responsibilities well such that constant supervision by higher P-level personnel is not needed.

24. **EFFORT** RATING: X 5 4 3 2 1  
 [Responsiveness; Mobilization; Day-to-day; Special situations (e.g. adverse/dangerous conditions)]  
 Mobilization of field activities took place very smoothly. Field personnel has handled contact with public very well. Contractor has worked tremendously hard to deal with a resident at the site who has proven to be very difficult. Has adjusted the work and schedule of activities to accommodate the concerns of this resident. Dealing with this resident has required a lot of extra effort and the contractor has handled the situation very well.

\*\*\*\*\*  
 25. **CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PREPARED BY PO** RATING: 5 4 3 2 1

26. **PO ASSESSMENT AND CERTIFICATION:**

27. PO SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

copy

1. SITE NAME: Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill 2. WA NO.: 11-5LAN 3. STATE: Michigan  
\*\*\*\*\*

EPA REGION V ARCS CONTRACT AWARD FEE  
WORK ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION REPORT (WACR)

\*\*\*\*\*

4. CONTRACTOR: WW Engineering & Science 5. CONTRACT NUMBER: 68-W8-0079  
  
6. CONTRACTOR REGIONAL MANAGER: Carl Malsom PHONE: (616) 942-9600  
7. PROJECT OFFICER (PO): Patricia Vogtman PHONE: (312) 886-9553  
8. CONTRACTING OFFICER (CO): Brigitte Manzke PHONE: (312) 886-6581  
9. WORK ASSIGNMENT MANAGER (WAM): Leah Evison PHONE: (312) 886-4696  
10. PERFORMANCE PERIOD FROM: 11/91 TO: 6/95 check dates

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CATEGORY

11. Check one: ☒ OVERALL TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION ☐ PROGRAM MGMT. EVALUATION

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

12. Check one:  
EVALUATION PREPARED BY ☒ WAM ☐ CO ☐ PO

13. Check one:  
☒ OUTSTANDING (5) ☐ EXCEEDED EXPECTATIONS (4) ☐ SATISFACTORY (3)  
☐ marginally SATISFACTORY (2) ☐ UNSATISFACTORY (1)

14. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF SCOPE OF WORK:  
Complete implementation of the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study, incorporating SACM and Presumptive Remedy principles at a municipal landfill National Demonstration Site.

15. OVERALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: The contractor did an excellent job of planning and implementing the RI/FS. Draft and final reports were uniformly excellent, both technically and in form. Communication with the RPM was especially good during this Work Assignment. The contractor suggested innovative approaches to the investigation and during the feasibility study, which resulted in a significant cost and time saving. The contractor showed great flexibility and inventiveness in stream-lining the project in accordance with SACM principles, at the same time as good judgement in suggesting ways to meet conflicting State requests. The contractor's Project Manager had a lot of foresight and a good sense of scheduling, which enabled her to plan activities and personnel well in advance and to highlight potential problems to the RPM early.

16. UNUSUAL PROBLEM/OCCURRENCES AFFECTING CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE:  
Although there were a number of unusual occurrences at this site during the contract period (e.g., disputes with the State, problematic relations with a nearby resident), the contractor did not allow any of them to affect their performance and in fact, the contractor was instrumental in helping U.S. EPA keep the project on track through the difficulties.

17. PHASE I AVAILABLE : PHASE I PAID:

18. PHASE II AVAILABLE:  
  
PHASE II RECOMMENDED? ☒ YES ☐ NO RECOMMENDED SIZE:  $\frac{90}{(0 - 100\%)}$  %

NOTE TO PAT/GLORIA/CARL: I don't know what the normal award would be for WA performance like that described here--I certainly want this award to stand out as I think it was exceptionally good. But I figured nobody's perfect, so I didn't give them 100%. But if we give quite a few 90% awards, I would like this one to be higher.

19. STATE SPECIFIC REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR PHASE II AWARD:  
(Additional pages may be attached if necessary)  
This contractor performed excellently in project planning, field investigation, and reporting phases of this work assignment. They broke new ground in implementing the Presumptive Remedy guidance for municipal landfill sites and worked diligently to keep to the letter and spirit of the guidance. The Project Manager showed an exceptional service-orientation. It is very difficult to identify areas for potential improvement in the contractor's work on this Work Assignment.

20. EVALUATOR SIGNATURE: LAKE DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*  
 EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORE SHEET  
 \*\*\*\*\*

21. PROJECT PLANNING RATING: X 5 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Organizing (e.g. work plan development, data review); Scheduling; Budgeting]  
 The contractor's project planning was excellent, beginning with development of a work plan which made use of the new streamlining/presumptive remedy guidance and met the disparate needs of the EPA HQ pilot project team and the State of Michigan. Field activities were planned to make on-the-spot use of field data to streamline sampling and drilling. The contractor performed efficient data reviews during the RI, addressing data quality issues and questions early with EPA's Central Regional Laboratory. Scheduling and budgeting throughout the RI/FS were efficient and in line with the SACM process.
22. TECHNICAL COMPETENCE & INNOVATION RATING: X 5 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Effectiveness of analysis; Meet plan goals; Expert testimony; Support COE/State/Enforcement; Adhere to Regs & procedures; Approach creativity/ingenuity]  
 During the RI, the contractor addressed unexpected drilling problems effectively and quickly while minimizing downtime and recommended innovative approaches using geophysical techniques rather than installing more monitoring wells. The Project Manager identifies technical problems to the RPM in a timely manner and consistently provides recommendations and solutions. The contractor's quick interpretation of geophysical surveys was especially helpful during dispute resolution with the State. The contractor suggested the consideration of innovative in-situ cleanup methods as part of the FS.
23. SCHEDULE & COST CONTROL RATING: \_\_\_ 5 X 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Budget (hours & cost) maintenance; Priority schedule adjustments; Cost minimization.]  
 The Project Manager frequently updated the RPM on budget considerations beyond the required monthly reporting and was very proficient at scheduling field staff for the greatest efficiency of time and money. The final cost of the RI/FS was considerably under budget. The contractor's suggestion of including an in-situ cleanup method in the FS resulted in a less costly contingent remedy being selected in the ROD.
24. REPORTING RATING: X 5 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Timeliness of deliverables; Clarity; Thoroughness]  
 The major deliverables (Work Plans, RI, FS and Risk Assessment) were consistently well-written, thorough, and submitted either on time or ahead of schedule. Pre-drafts were often submitted for early EPA review, which streamlined the review process. The contractor was especially responsive in designing figures and tables which highlighted essential elements of the site for easy review. The Project Manager was especially helpful in giving oral and written status summaries to several new RPMs on the project, so that time was not lost in bringing the new EPA staff up to speed. During field work, quick reporting of investigation results and efficient turn-around kept the project on track.
25. RESOURCE UTILIZATION RATING: X 5 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Staffing; Subcontracting; Equipment, Travel, etc.]  
 The contractor made efficient use of personnel during field investigation. Field technicians were experienced and competent and there was good consistency through the project. The contractor managed their subcontractors well and proposed coordinating with EPA's Technical Support Section and using EPA equipment rather than renting for some geophysical work, which saved money. The contractor minimized travel to the site by good field work scheduling and minimized travel during document review by frequently combining trips to Chicago with other EPA projects.
26. EFFORT RATING: X 5 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Responsiveness; Mobilization; Day-to-day; Special situations (e.g. adverse/dangerous conditions)]  
 The contractor showed exceptional effort in working with Region 5 and EPA HQ to developing model RI/FS and Risk Assessment outlines to meet the new Presumptive Remedy guidance. The Project Manager maintains very good day-to-day contact with the RPM and is unusually responsive to request, often going beyond what is explicitly asked for. Mobilization of field activities was smooth, including last-minute mobilization to oversee State test pitting. Field personnel handled contact with sometimes difficult nearby residents and State personnel very well and adjusted work schedules to accommodate their concerns. The Project Manager was extremely helpful in developing multiple contingency plans to address possible outcomes of two lengthy disputes between the EPA and the State.

[ TO BE FILLED OUT BY PROJECT OFFICER ONLY ]

SITE NAME:

WA NO.:

CONTRACTOR: WW Engineering & Science

\*\*\*\*\*

EPA REGION V ARCS CONTRACT AWARD FEE  
WORK ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION REPORT (WACR)

\*\*\*\*\*

27. PROJECT SCHEDULE AND COST INFORMATION:

REVISED FINAL LOE: \_\_\_\_\_

REVISED FINAL COST: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENT:

28. CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PREPARED BY PO

RATING: \_\_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_ 1

PHASE II RECOMMENDED? \_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_ NO RECOMMENDED SIZE: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
(0 - 100%)

PHASE II AVAILABLE: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ PHASE II RECOMMENDED: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

29. PO ASSESSMENT AND CERTIFICATION:

30. PO SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

1. SITE NAME: Albion-Sheridan Municipal Landfill 2. WA NO.: 11-5LAN 3. STATE: Michigan

\*\*\*\*\*

EPA REGION V ARCS CONTRACT AWARD FEE REPORT

\*\*\*\*\*

4. Check one: ☐ SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT (SER) ☒ PERFORMANCE EVENT REPORT (PER)

5. CONTRACTOR: WW Engineering & Science 6. CONTRACT NUMBER: 68-W8-0079

7. CONTRACTOR REGIONAL MANAGER: Carl Malsom PHONE: (616) 942-9600

8. PROJECT OFFICER (PO): Thomas Short PHONE: (312) 353-8826

9. CONTRACTING OFFICER (CO): Marshall McReynolds PHONE: (312) 886-5858

10. WORK ASSIGNMENT MANAGER (WAM): Leah Evison PHONE: (312) 886-4696

11. PERFORMANCE PERIOD FROM: 11/01/93 TO: 04/30/94

=====

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CATEGORY

12. Check one: ☒ OVERALL TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION ☐ PROGRAM MGMT. EVALUATION

=====

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

13. Check one:  
EVALUATION PREPARED BY ☒ WAM ☐ CO ☐ PO

14. Check one:  
☒ OUTSTANDING (5) ☐ EXCEEDED EXPECTATIONS (4) ☐ SATISFACTORY (3)  
☐ marginally satisfactory (2) ☐ UNSATISFACTORY (1)

-----

15. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES:

Provided technical support to EPA in technical meeting with MDNR, continued collection of ground water level and landfill subsidence data, prepared draft Remedial Investigation Report, assisted EPA in evaluating MDNR magnetometer survey data, found lost MDNR monitoring wells, assisted EPA in resolving two formal disputes with MDNR, submitted draft Risk Assessment, cooperated fully with MDNR's request to use decontamination area prepared by WWES, prepared ground water models to support Feasibility Study, submitted draft Feasibility Study, repaired fence and investigated septic system on the site, reviewed MDNR work plan for test pitting, submitted final Remedial Investigation Report.

-----

16. OVERALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:

The overall performance of WWES during this evaluation period was outstanding. The quality of the major deliverables during this period was excellent. The contractor was especially helpful in making sure that the work and documents reflected the Presumptive Remedy/SACM approach chosen for this national demonstration site. The Site Project Manager was extremely responsive to last-minute requests by the RPM, especially in supplying information for the two formal disputes with the MDNR.

-----

17. STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES/NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS:

The Site Project Manager was always knowledgeable about details of progress made by other staff doing work for this site and was creative in suggesting ideas for how to deal with differing opinions from the State. The contractor produced documents ahead of the due dates in order to accommodate the EPA. The technical staff doing work on this project, e.g. landfill engineers, geochemical and ground water flow modelers, risk assessors, did excellent work and were particularly helpful in meeting with RPM and explaining their work, and responding to comments from EPA and the State.

-----

18. EVALUATOR SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORE SHEET**  
 \*\*\*\*\*

19. **PROJECT PLANNING** RATING: X 5 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Organizing (e.g. work plan development, data review); Scheduling; Budgeting]

The contractor was very helpful in suggesting areas of the RI/FS process that could be streamlined, often before suggestions were asked for, and was clearly interested in helping the presumptive remedy/SACM process to work well at this site. Innovative methods were applied to the Baseline Risk Assessment, consistent with new EPA guidance, which resulted in a faster and more useful product for this site.

20. **TECHNICAL COMPETENCE & INNOVATION** RATING: X 5 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Effectiveness of analysis; Meet plan goals; Expert testimony; Support COE/State/Enforcement; Adhere to Regs & procedures; Approach creativity/ingenuity]

The contractor's technical work, incorporated into the RI and FS reports, has been uniformly outstanding. The RPM especially appreciated the ability of the contractor's technical staff to explain their reasoning and advice to her and their quick response to suggestions. Their commendable implementation and interpretation of geophysical surveys of the site was especially helpful to the RPM during dispute resolution with the State. The contractor ably evaluated an innovative technology (air sparging for arsenic contamination) in the FS.

21. **SCHEDULE & COST CONTROL** RATING: \_\_\_ 5 X 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Budget (hours & cost) maintenance; Priority schedule adjustments; Cost minimization.]

The contractor was very responsive to RPM request to speed up completion of some documents; this resulted in some deliverables being submitted ahead of schedule and still within cost estimates. The consultant's Project Manager frequently offered budget hours and cost updates on specific tasks to the RPM, without being specifically requested.

22. **REPORTING** RATING: X 5 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Timeliness of deliverables; Clarity; Thoroughness]

The Remedial Investigation, Feasibility Study and Risk Assessment Reports done during this evaluation period were consistently excellent in content and presentation. The contractor was especially responsive in designing figures and tables which highlight the essential elements of the site. Deliverables were submitted either on time or ahead of schedule.

23. **RESOURCE UTILIZATION** RATING: \_\_\_ 5 X 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Staffing; Subcontracting; Equipment, Travel, etc.]

The contractor's staff shows impressive breadth and depth and was especially helpful in completing most of this project without subcontractors, which speeded up the project. Work done by subcontractors was well-managed and utilized efficiently. Travel and costs were minimized in completing these reports, for example, the contractor frequently arranged to combine tasks in the same trip to the site.

24. **EFFORT** RATING: X 5 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 [Responsiveness; Mobilization; Day-to-day; Special situations (e.g. adverse/dangerous conditions)]

The contractor was unusually responsive to EPA's needs, within the contract, especially in developing prototype presumptive remedy RI/FS documents which will serve as examples in this national demonstration project. The Site Project Manager developed multiple contingency plans to address possible outcomes of two lengthy disputes between the EPA and the State. The Site Project Manager provides an outstanding level of day-to-day communication with the RPM and is also especially sensitive to the needs of residents living adjacent to this site and to State relations.

- \*\*\*\*\*  
 25. **CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PREPARED BY PO** RATING: \_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_ 1  
 \*\*\*\*\*

26. **PO ASSESSMENT AND CERTIFICATION:**

27. PO SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_



1. SITE NAME: Albion-Sheridan Landfill 2. WA NO.:11-5LAN 3. STATE: MI  
\*\*\*\*\*

EPA REGION V ARCS CONTRACT AWARD FEE REPORT  
\*\*\*\*\*

4. Check one: ☐ SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT (SER) ☒ PERFORMANCE EVENT REPORT (PER)  
5. CONTRACTOR: WW Engineering & Science 6. CONTRACT NUMBER: 68-WB-0079  
7. CONTRACTOR REGIONAL MANAGER: Carl Malsom PHONE: (616) 942-9600  
8. PROJECT OFFICER (PO): Thomas Short PHONE: (312) 353-8826  
9. CONTRACTING OFFICER (CO): Marshall McReynolds PHONE: (312) 886-5858  
10. WORK ASSIGNMENT MANAGER (WAM): Leah Evison (reassigned from M.P. Tyson) PHONE: (312) 886-4696  
11. PERFORMANCE PERIOD FROM: 05/01/93 TO: 10/31/93

=====

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CATEGORY

12. Check one: ☒ OVERALL TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION ☐ PROGRAM MGMT. EVALUATION  
=====

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

13. Check one:  
EVALUATION PREPARED BY ☒ WAM ☐ CO ☐ PO  
14. Check one:  
☐ OUTSTANDING (5) ☒ EXCEEDED EXPECTATIONS (4) ☐ SATISFACTORY (3)  
☐ marginally satisfactory (2) ☐ UNSATISFACTORY (1)

-----

15. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES: Submitted draft Magnetometer survey results; performed additional geophysical logging. Conducted two rounds of ground water sampling. Surveyed land subsidence monuments. Completed draft Phase I Summary Report for RI, including Preliminary Ecological Assessment. Began Risk Assessment.

-----

16. OVERALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: Contractor is very good technically and very organized. Site Manager is unusually helpful in keeping consistency and keeping work progressing as assigned RPM change twice during this period.

-----

17. STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES/NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS: Site Manager has exceptional foresight, keeps RPM very well informed of upcoming events and decisions which need to be made, and offers very good advice regarding technical repercussions of EPA policy decisions for the site. Contractor is very responsive to minor changes in work and priority adjustments, and mindfull of keeping with budget and SOW restraints.

-----

18. EVALUATOR SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORE SHEET**  
 \*\*\*\*\*

19. **PROJECT PLANNING** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1

[Organizing (e.g. work plan development, data review); Scheduling; Budgeting]

In data review, scheduling and budgeting this review period, the contractor has consistently balanced the need to follow new HQ guidance on streamlining with the need to optimize information gathering. Contractor suggested innovative in-situ cleanup methods which should result in reduced cost.

20. **TECHNICAL COMPETENCE & INNOVATION** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1

[Effectiveness of analysis; Meet plan goals; Expert testimony; Support COE/State/Enforcement; Adhere to Regs & procedures; Approach creativity/ingenuity]

The contractor demonstrates above average technical skills in analyzing field data and suggesting innovative solutions to ground water issues. Deliverables are thorough and adhere very well to guidance for this pilot project.

21. **SCHEDULE & COST CONTROL** RATING: 5 4 X 3 2 1

[Budget (hours & cost) maintenance; Priority schedule adjustments; Cost minimization.]

All tasks completed on time, and costs were within budget and reasonable, considering the scope of effort.

22. **REPORTING** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1

[Timeliness of deliverables; Clarity; Thoroughness]

All reports are of consistent high quality in content and presentation. Contractor offers invaluable help to new RPM in oral reports of the status of the site and is unusually responsive to requests for summaries of previous activities during transition period.

23. **RESOURCE UTILIZATION** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1

[Staffing; Subcontracting; Equipment, Travel, etc.]

Staff is knowledgeable and utilized in an effective and efficient manner. Field technicians are experienced and handle responsibilities well such that constant supervision by higher P-level personnel is not needed.

24. **EFFORT** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1

[Responsiveness; Mobilization; Day-to-day; Special situations (e.g. adverse/dangerous conditions)]

Contractor is very responsive to minor changes in work and priority adjustments in response to continuing discussions between EPA and the State and at the same time very mindful of resource allocation. Day to day communication with regional personnel is unusually helpful.

\*\*\*\*\*  
 25. **CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PREPARED BY PO** RATING: 5 4 3 2 1

26. **PO ASSESSMENT AND CERTIFICATION:**

27. PO SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

1. SITE NAME: Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill 2. WA NO.: 11-5LAN 3. STATE: \*\*\*\*\*

EPA REGION V ARCS CONTRACT AWARD FEE REPORT

4. Check one: ☐ SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT (SER) ☒ PERFORMANCE EVENT REPORT (PER)  
5. CONTRACTOR: WW Engineering & Science 6. CONTRACT NUMBER: 68-W8-0079

7. CONTRACTOR REGIONAL MANAGER: Carl Malsom PHONE: (616) 942-9600  
8. PROJECT OFFICER (PO): Patricia Vogtman PHONE: (312) 886-9553  
9. CONTRACTING OFFICER (CO): Brigitte Manzke PHONE: (312) 886-6581  
10. WORK ASSIGNMENT MANAGER (WAM): PHONE:

11. PERFORMANCE PERIOD FROM: 05/01/94 TO: 10/31/94

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CATEGORY

12. Check one: ☒ OVERALL TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION ☐ PROGRAM MGMT. EVALUATION

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

13. Check one:  
EVALUATION PREPARED BY ☒ WAM ☐ CO ☐ PO

14. Check one:  
☐ OUTSTANDING (5) ☒ EXCEEDED EXPECTATIONS (4) ☐ SATISFACTORY (3)  
☐ marginally satisfactory (2) ☐ UNSATISFACTORY (1)

15. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES:

Prepared draft final and final Presumptive Remedy Risk Assessment and Final Feasibility Study, oversight of MDNR test pitting, responded to MDNR comments on Risk Assessment, resolved validity issues for 2 groundwater samples, analyzed proposed landfill cap location with respect to nearby residence, reviewed draft Proposed Plan for technical correctness, conferred regarding preparations for public meeting and participated in meeting as requested.

16. OVERALL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:

The overall performance of WWES during this evaluation period exceeded my expectations. The quality of the major deliverables during this period was very good. The contractor was especially helpful in making sure that the work and documents reflected the Presumptive Remedy/SACM approach chosen for this national demonstration site. The Site Project Manager was extremely responsive to last-minute requests by the RPM, especially regarding changes to the cost analysis of the Feasibility Study.

17. STRENGTHS/WEAKNESSES/NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS:

The Site Project Manager was always knowledgeable about details of the documents being prepared by her office and was creative in suggesting ideas for how to implement a monitoring program which would meet the differing viewpoints of the State and Federal programs. The contractor produced documents on time. The technical staff doing work on this project, e.g. risk assessment specialist and statistician, did excellent work and were particularly helpful in meeting with RPM and explaining their work, and responding to comments from EPA and the State. The cost analyses of the Feasibility Study could have been clearer with respect to what was used to calculate costs for groundwater monitoring.

18. EVALUATOR SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORE SHEET**  
 \*\*\*\*\*

19. **PROJECT PLANNING** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1

[Organizing (e.g. work plan development, data review); Scheduling; Budgeting]

The contractor was successful in carrying through a streamlined Feasibility Study and finalizing the Risk Assessment and was interested in helping the presumptive remedy/SACM process to work well at this site. Innovative methods were applied to the final Baseline Risk Assessment, consistent with new EPA guidance, which resulted in more useful products for this site.

20. **TECHNICAL COMPETENCE & INNOVATION** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1

[Effectiveness of analysis; Meet plan goals; Expert testimony; Support COE/State/Enforcement; Adhere to Regs & procedures; Approach creativity/ingenuity]

The contractor continues to produce very good technical work, incorporating an innovative technology into the final Feasibility Study and showing creativity in proposing statistical methods for groundwater monitoring. The contractor also provided very good technical support during the public meeting.

21. **SCHEDULE & COST CONTROL** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1

[Budget (hours & cost) maintenance; Priority schedule adjustments; Cost minimization.]

The Site Project Manager continues to keep the RPM appraised of budget hours and cost updates on specific tasks without being specifically requested. The contractor conducted their own assessment of money saved through the streamlined Presumptive Remedy approach at this site and estimated approximately a 20% savings in cost over a standard RI/FS. This estimate has been helpful to EPA in encouraging future use of the Presumptive Remedy.

22. **REPORTING** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1

[Timeliness of deliverables; Clarity; Thoroughness]

The final Feasibility Study and Risk Assessment Reports done during this evaluation period were consistently more than satisfactory in content and presentation. Deliverables were submitted either on time or ahead of schedule. The Site Project Manager was always responsive to requests to submit parts of deliverables ahead of schedule for discussion purposes.

23. **RESOURCE UTILIZATION** RATING: 5 X 4 3 2 1

[Staffing; Subcontracting; Equipment, Travel, etc.]

The contractor's staff continues to show an impressive breadth and depth and was especially helpful in completing most of this project without subcontractors, which speeded up the project. Work done by subcontractors was well-managed and utilized efficiently. Travel and costs were minimized in completing these reports, for example, the contractor frequently arranged to combine tasks in the same trip to the site.

24. **EFFORT** RATING: X 5 4 3 2 1

[Responsiveness; Mobilization; Day-to-day; Special situations (e.g. adverse/dangerous conditions)]

The contractor continued to be unusually responsive to EPA's needs, within the contract, especially in responding to MDNR comments on the draft final Risk Assessment and Feasibility Study. The Site Project Manager provides an outstanding level of day-to-day communication with the RPM and continues to be sensitive to the needs of residents living adjacent to this site and to State relations. The contractor was able to mobilize quickly to oversee MDNR test pitting, despite a changing schedule from the MDNR.

\*\*\*\*\*  
 25. **CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PREPARED BY PO** RATING: 5 4 3 2 1

26. **PO ASSESSMENT AND CERTIFICATION:**

27. PO SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_